



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

particularly Bacchides 107 ff.; Pseudolus 573 b (Tibicen vos interibi hic delectaverit); Cistellaria 630; Trinummus 601, 1114; Hauton 873. He adds some general aspects of modern division into acts and finally rests his case in these words (83-85):

In our study of scene-complexes we have revealed evidence of an apparent effort to preserve continuity of action; the recurrence of this technique even where vacant stages are inevitable, has led us to doubt if those vacant stages indicate anything but momentary unessential pauses. Once such vacant stages lose their significance, it becomes at least an open question whether other vacant stages in places where the technique of continuous action is not employed, are really significant of essential pauses in the action. This becomes a more plausible suggestion if such vacant stages find a ready explanation in peculiar conditions of the play, or of the context in which they appear. . . . It seems, therefore, altogether reasonable to suppose that in Roman comedy the vacant stages very regularly mark only momentary, insignificant pauses, and that the variation in the number of vacant stages and in the amount of intervening action is often due simply to the nature of the comic plot.

Dr. Conrad has performed a very difficult and a very comprehensive task. It is no slight thing to digest and classify the scene-complexes in something like 21,000 verses of Plautus and 6,000 verses of Terence, or to reduce them to categories that admit of brief and adequate description. One who had considered only a quarter of the whole bulk might well feel that classification were well nigh impossible. Yet the author has reduced it all to manageable categories. Throughout the whole there is constant reference to Leo, especially to his *Plautinische Forschungen* and to his *Monolog*, to Legrand's *Daos*, and to such evidence as can be drawn from the new Menander. Each chapter ends with a concise summary—one misses only a similar summary of the details of continuous technique. If the trend is destructive as regards any basis for act-division, that is because we ought not to expect to find any such basis, if, as Dr. Conrad thinks, none ever existed. The reviewer has noticed only one serious misprint—the interchange of the words “entering” and “retiring”, on page 49, line 5. All students of Latin should feel indebted to Dr. Conrad for this treatment of a difficult aspect of Latin comedy.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS. ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.

The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy. By Clinton C. Conrad. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Co. (1915). Pp. 86.

In recent years scholars have been inclined to abandon as insoluble the problem of dividing the Roman comedies into acts, but have cherished the hope of determining from them the practice of Greek New Comedy. In particular, Leo rendered a distinct service to the cause of clearer thinking by reverting to the Greek term *μέρος*. Utterly disregarding the vulgate act divisions, he treated Plautus and Terence as if they were

Greek writers and divided their dramas into from three or four to seven *μέρη* each. The recent discovery of *ΧΟΡΟΙ* to mark choral interludes in the fragments of Menander and others has lent zest to such attempts.

Now Mr. Conrad approaches the problem from a point of view which is not only new but is calculated to throw light upon the Latin aspect of the question. He endeavors (page 6)

(1) to reveal the devices employed in Roman comedy to secure continuity of action; and (2) to establish a strong probability that in view of the recurrence of the same devices in the action surrounding many of the so-called ‘vacant stages’ such ‘vacant stages’ do not indicate an essential pause in the action.

It was the more necessary to set this quotation before readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY for the reason that the title of the dissertation scarcely makes the duality of aims sufficiently clear. Though technique is perhaps the primary object of study, it is consistently employed to establish the broader thesis. It will be understood that I am not objecting to the title, but merely indicating that it covers more ground than, at first glance, it would seem to cover. The general trend of the author's conclusions would be to discountenance the division of Roman comedies into acts or the formulation of any theory of act division; they are even more hostile to the traditional divisions than were the *μέρος* proposals.

The nature of the investigation necessarily requires the citation of so many illustrative passages and these differ so subtly one from another that I have found the task of preparing a satisfactory digest of the argument most difficult. I must content myself with the baldest kind of an outline.

In the Introduction, then, Mr. Conrad traces the influence of the chorus in Greek drama, discusses the meaning of *ΧΟΡΟΙ* in Aristophanes and New Comedy, and inquires whether Plautus and Terence were themselves unconscious of act divisions in their own compositions and whether their plays were intended for continuous performance. On the basis of external evidence the author decides these questions in the affirmative. He concludes with a discussion of certain criteria which have been proposed for determining play divisions.

When an imaginary lapse of time coincides with a vacant stage, the fact has been used as an argument for terminating an act at that point. Accordingly, Mr. Conrad devotes his first chapter to the Presentation of Smaller Units of Time in Plautus and Terence. In the first place, he shows that temporal adverbs like *mox*, *iam*, *dudum*, *iam dudum*, *modo*, etc., are entirely subjective, varying according to the mood of the speaker. In my opinion, this demonstration is the most valuable feature of the whole dissertation. Some one ought to undertake a similar investigation for Greek drama.

In the second place, an examination of the time interval allowed for the completion of off-stage action in passages which are indisputably continuous reveals the greatest diversity, the action being sometimes expanded, sometimes contracted. This part of the chapter some-

what overlaps pages 84-92 of Brasse's *Quatenus in Fabulis Plautinis et Loci et Temporis Unitatibus Species Veritatis Neglegatur* (1914); our author states (page 18, note 44) that he had seen a review of this work, while he was engaged in printing his own dissertation, but had been unable to obtain a copy. Mr. Conrad's treatment is superior for two reasons: (a) he cites examples from Terence as well as from Plautus, and (b) he restricts these, in the main, to portions of the plays which do not involve so uncertain a quantity as a vacant stage.

Having thus disposed of the preliminaries to his satisfaction, Mr. Conrad now approaches the heart of his investigation, *Technique of Continuous Action* (Chapter II). Here he discusses certain "scene complexes" in passages which are undeniably continuous. These belong to two types. In the first, an actor withdraws from the stage for a longer or shorter period and the time of his absence is occupied by the words of one or more other characters. As was to be expected, such intervals are filled by soliloquies or dialogues; sometimes these develop the plot or the characterization of the performers, sometimes they are mere stop-gaps. In the second type of scene complexes, no actor withdraws, but the dramatist links two passages together by employing some variation of the unseen actor motive. It will be observed that neither type involves the vacant stage. In notes 4, 9, and 11-14 Greek parallels to some of the devices discussed in the adjacent text are noted.

In Chapter III, *Vacant Stages Which are Admitted to Indicate No Essential Pause*, the argument is carried a step further. Sometimes a character, just before his withdrawal, refers to the approach of another actor whom he is supposed to be able to observe in the distance, but who is still off stage. And sometimes a character upon entering alludes to another who has just left the stage but is still in the speaker's line of vision. In passages of a third type the stage is undoubtedly vacant, but Mr. Conrad contends that the urgency arising from the dramatic situation requires the pause to be reduced to a minimum. The fact that some vacant stages are negligible is incontrovertible, but in my opinion many of the passages here adduced are beside the point. Vacant stages of the first and second types are constructive rather than actual, and might better have been included in Chapter II as illustrating another kind of technique employed to secure continuity of action. From this rearrangement of his material, however, the author was estopped by the fact that these two types do not involve scene complexes.

If the author had stopped at this point, or after discussing the less debatable of the instances treated in Chapter IV, he would have satisfied the first object of his inquiry, the study of technique in continuous action, and would have been comparatively immune to criticism. At the same time, his tangible results would have been inconsiderable. Accordingly, his secondary object, that of discrediting practically every essential pause in the action and so *ex hypothesi* every act division,

though not entirely neglected hitherto, now forges to the front. Chapter IV is entitled *Technique of Action Environing Vacant Stages Which are Commonly Supposed to Mark an Essential Pause*, and treats the numerous passages which involve the same types of scene complexes about a vacant stage (commonly supposed to mark an essential pause), as were found in Chapter II when a character withdraws without leaving the stage vacant. But the fact of the stage being continuously occupied or being left vacant makes all the difference in the world in the significance of the technique, and this difference seriously impairs the validity and plausibility of the argument. Moreover, the fact that the non-essential vacant stages discussed in Chapter III belong to an entirely different category from those treated in Chapters II and IV prevents the gulf's being adequately bridged at that point.

The most intractable instances still remain upon Mr. Conrad's hands for discussion in Chapter V. Since these passages do not involve scene complexes, they are not, strictly speaking, germane to the argument. But the author doubtless felt (and rightly so) that, in view of the secondary object of his investigation and the uniformity with which up to this point vacant stages had been declared to indicate non-essential pauses, he was in duty bound to treat the few instances yet surviving. Of these the most incorrigible are the vacant stages which separate the withdrawal and reappearance of the same character. The fact that such a character is always thought of as performing off-stage action during the vacant stage and occasionally action which would require somewhat of an interval does not make the situation easier. With the exception of *Heauton 170*, every such vacant stage is discussed in this chapter. In view of these and other difficult instances Mr. Conrad acknowledges that

there remains, of course, a fairly large number to which our study of technique does not apply, except in so far as, once we have provided for a large number of vacant stages that are not significant of essential pauses, the probability that the other vacant stages are necessarily significant is much weakened. . . . But there would still remain a small minority of vacant stages which everybody must admit furnish reasonable grounds for the view that there were some essential pauses in the action, at least in the Greek original, and possibly even in the Latin adaptation.

He disavows also any intention of "eliminating all the vacant stages from the text of Roman comedy" (71). In practice, however, he is not so generous, but proceeds to muster every particle of evidence against each passage in order

to suggest how these critical cases might be reconciled with a view that the action of Roman comedies was uniformly continuous, if anybody cares after our discussion of technique to foster that view.

Of the ten vacant stages here discussed the author definitely rejects in four instances the possibility that they mark an essential pause; in four other cases his judgment is less clearly expressed but apparently is again adverse. In the two remaining passages he

states the situation without expressing an opinion. One receives a very distinct impression that Mr. Conrad would have liked to repudiate every vacant stage on the list but lacked the final courage to do so. At any rate, there is not a single instance, not even Pseudolus 573 b, which he frankly grants to have marked an essential pause. The second half of Chapter V is devoted to Some Aspects of Modern Divisions into Acts.

It may be stated at once that Mr. Conrad has been thoroughly trained in the manipulation of philological data. His dissertation is a worthy effort and increases our knowledge of the subject. Such criticisms as occur to me arise mainly from the fact that in my opinion his primary foundations are not strong enough to bear the full weight of his secondary conclusions, or, in other words, that he tries to prove too much. Assessed at their utmost value, the scene complexes of Chapter II create nothing more than a "probability" with reference to the vacant stages of Chapter IV; their bearing upon the passages discussed in Chapter V becomes so tenuous as to approach or pass the vanishing point. In fact, it would be possible to frame the argument from an exactly opposite point of view; since not even Mr. Conrad ventures to eliminate all the essential pauses discussed in Chapter V, these might be employed to establish a plausibility with reference to the more dubious of the instances treated in Chapter IV and to counterbalance the plausibility drawn by our author from Chapter II. In my opinion, the truth will be found to lie somewhere between these extremes. In the present state of our knowledge, to distribute the vacant stages in Chapter IV between the conflicting parties is a subjective problem which requires every possible aid to be called into play. In this process Mr. Conrad's contributions will find a place. But they are not entitled to exclusive consideration, as they would be, if accepted at par. Their main value will be the negative one of exercising a restraining influence upon the extravagant claims of other criteria. Subject to obvious reservations and more conservatively stated, I believe they would be almost as serviceable for their bearing upon Greek comedy as upon that of the Romans. In all future studies of play divisions among the ancients they must be taken into account.

This reminds me of another matter. Mr. Conrad nowhere indicates whether this technique came from the Greek writers, their Latin translators, or the changed conditions of representation. I believe that the first and third possibilities must also be taken into consideration (see below) and that the recognition of this fact would materially affect the significance which is to be attached to the phenomena under discussion. But the whole validity of Mr. Conrad's argument, as I understand it, depends upon the assumption of the second of these possibilities; our author's words on page 35, "It is difficult to suppose that a technique which secures continuous action is employed *quite accidentally*", etc. (the italics are mine), point in the same direction. But is this assumption a reasonable one? In Chapter II cer-

tain scene complexes are discussed which cover a character's withdrawal when there is manifestly no act division. As we have seen, several Greek parallels are cited here, and their number is undoubtedly restricted only by the limited amount of New Comedy at our disposal. Then in Chapter IV the recurrence of such scene complexes where there *is* a possibility of an essential pause is employed in order to prove that there was none. But *until the contrary is proved*, is there not a strong presumption that the Latin poet was simply translating his Greek original in this case as in the other? And the use of an intermezzic chorus did occasion essential pauses in Greek plays, technique or no technique. Therefore, does Mr. Conrad not rest under the necessity of proving that the use of such technique at any point which can be shown with some plausibility to correspond to *XOPOT* in the Greek originals was due to the Latin translator? Since it is obviously impossible to do this specifically in each case, general considerations must provide the only defense available. There are some slight indications that our author is conscious of this difficulty, but the issue is nowhere plainly faced. Thus, he is left with an uncomfortable burden of proof resting upon his shoulders.

The weakest part of the dissertation, in my opinion, is its Introduction. Curiously enough, it is at the same time too pretentious and not enough so! That is to say, if Mr. Conrad had confined himself to the study of technique in passages where continuity of action is either granted by all or denied by a negligible few, the sketchiest kind of an Introduction would have sufficed, but the moment he passed to the second phase of his subject and sought to prove the action continuous at practically every point, he at once came under the necessity of laying the foundations of his structure with the utmost care and thoroughness. I do not consider that Mr. Conrad's Introduction measures up to this requirement. This criticism lies especially against the discussion of the question whether Plautus and Terence were conscious of act divisions in their own compositions.

The external evidence here depends upon the impossibility of tracing the act divisions in Terence beyond Donatus, or possibly Varro, upon several statements in the ancient commentaries which indicate an undivided text or an uninterrupted performance, etc. I consider this evidence less definitive than Mr. Conrad evidently believes it to be. The first proof rests upon the tacit assumption that the early MSS were derived from Terence's prompt book and consequently that the absence in them of any mark of act division or of any direction for pauses proves the original performance to have been continuous. This assumption may be correct, but is incapable of proof. As to the statements quoted in the second proof, the possibility must be taken into consideration that they were derived from no trustworthy tradition but are mere inferences from the fact that the MSS were *obscurae edita* in this respect and that the acts *non facile a parum doctis distingui possunt*; compare Wessner, I.38, 266. In his discussion

of the external evidence I wonder why Mr. Conrad did not mention Andronicus's statement: *χρηται . . . ὁ Τερέντιος, καὶ εἰς πέντε σκηνὰς διαίρει τὸ δράμα*. The unchallenged inclusion of this tractate in Van Leeuwen's *Prolegomena ad Aristophanem* (1908), 191 would seem to have given it a standing which would demand that it be taken into consideration here. If genuine, this notice is about as early as any cited and is by far the most specific.

As regards the internal evidence Mr. Conrad contents himself with treating some of the criteria which have been proposed for determining the significance of a vacant stage. In the reviewer's judgment, this discussion is too pessimistic and lacks the "sympathy" which the author rightly states (15) is required in dealing with such problems. Even in Leo's case Mr. Conrad's refutation fails to satisfy, and Professor Foster's contentions are curtly dismissed in nine lines and with a reference to a one-page review. I fully recognize that such criteria are not infallible and that they are largely subjective in their application; but I have already intimated that, until our fund of information concerning these matters is far more extensive than it is to-day, we must continue to use them, subject to such correction as the investigations of Mr. Conrad and others may enable us to employ.

But whatever doubt there may be as to the Roman comedians' being conscious of *actus* divisions in their plays, this much at least can be said: they could not fail to be aware of the *μέρος* divisions in such of the plays they were translating as had these divisions marked by *XOPOT*. I insert this qualification for the reason that it is not at present known how extensively *XOPOT* was employed in editions of Greek comedy. And they must have remained aware of these divisions whether they did or did not place any Latin equivalent of *XOPOT* in their MSS at these points, and if the stage performance had neither a choral intermezzo nor even a pause there. Of course, when a play was contaminated or otherwise altered, some of these Greek *μέρη* would be obscured, but not all of them. Now I conceive Terence to have been goaded by the attacks of his critics into translating Menander's *Heauton* without contamination and as closely and literally as the differences in the genius of the two languages would allow. Can it be said, in such a case, that the poet who was necessarily aware of the *μέρος* (*XOPOT*) divisions in the Greek play was yet unconscious of divisions in his translation?

In the first place, we must grant that Plautus or Terence may have been aware of the *thing* without using *actus*, *pars*, *membrum*, or any other Latin word to designate it, for Mr. Conrad (11, n. 18) follows Hauler in translating *primo actu* in Hecyra 39 as "at the beginning of the performance".

Waiving this quibble over names, we may say that the transference of a consciousness of divisions from the Greek play to the Roman translation would depend upon the difference in meaning between a *μέρος* and what either then or subsequently was known as an *actus*.

Now the hypothesis to Euripides's *Andromache* shows that in Greek tragedy the first *μέρος* contained the prologos and the parodos, the second *μέρος* the first epeisodion and stasimon, etc. This is exactly the meaning of *actus* in Seneca's tragedies. Therefore, at however late a date the Roman comedians did indicate acts in their plays, it is likely that also in comedy there was a similar resemblance, *mutatis mutandis*, between a Greek *μέρος* and a Roman *actus*. Moreover, if Plautus or Terence ever introduced choral intermezzi or pauses in the production of their plays, surely these normally came at points which were indicated by *XOPOT* in their originals. And just to the extent that the Latin *actus* approximated the Greek *μέρος* in meaning and the conditions of the Roman performance conformed to those of the Greek play, would the consciousness which the Roman poet had of the *μέρος* divisions in the Greek original be unavoidably transferred to the corresponding points of division in his translation.

On page 5 Mr. Conrad declares, "I do not wish to be understood as formulating any new theory of act division; on the contrary, the general trend of my study, in that regard, is destructive", and on page 47 he points out that Leo was sometimes inconsistent in his use of *μέρος* and *actus* and nowhere clearly defined what he understood by them. These remarks raise the question as to what is meant by an act and what tokens we may justly demand to be present before we shall acknowledge an act division.

Of course, every one recognizes that act connotes many things to us now which corresponding terms did not mean to the ancients. For example, the most obvious sign of an act ending now is the lowering of the curtain. But it is fairly certain that this test would rule out all Greek drama and perhaps most of Latin drama. On the contrary, even in contemporaneous plays the curtain is sometimes lowered to denote a lapse of time at points which are not recognized as act endings in the playbill.

Must the acts correspond to definite chapters in the development of the plot? Such divisions are represented rather by the *πρότασις*, *ἐπίτασις*, and *καταστροφή*, which have misled some, both in ancient and in modern times, into maintaining that all plays should contain exactly three acts. But Holzapfel, *Kennt die Griechische Tragödie eine Akteinteilung?* (1914), has shown that these tripartite divisions often terminate in the middle of an epeisodion! Holzapfel answers the question of his title in the negative, and there is no doubt that he is correct, if we foist this connotation of the word upon the ancients.

Is a pause in the performance required for an act division? There is general agreement that Shakespeare's plays were given continuous presentation, and the earliest editions of some of them contain no indications of act divisions. Yet will any one therefore maintain that Shakespeare had no act-consciousness? Archer is so convinced of the opposite that he challenges the current view concerning the Elizabethan manner

of producing plays. He declares (Play-Making, 131):

The act division was perfectly familiar to Shakespeare, and was used by him to give to the action of his plays a rhythm which ought not, in representation, to be obscured or falsified . . . it was present to Shakespeare's mind no less than to Ibsen's or Pinero's.

These hints might easily be expanded but suffice to show how any one test or how several tests for act division may fail without really disproving the main point at issue. If our modern plays which observe the unities of time and place were printed in solid text after the ancient manner, how difficult it would be sometimes to resolve them into acts again, and, in some cases, even to convict the author of act-consciousness in composing them. In view of the foregoing, surely Leo's inconsistency is a venial fault, and the failure to define was perhaps a wise precaution. It may be observed that Mr. Conrad is equally circumspect, though of course the nature of his subject did not require him to give a definition.

The temptation is strong upon me to review Mr. Conrad's discussion of certain passages in Chapters IV and V. Forbearance is especially difficult with reference to Heauton 170 and Bacchides 107, in which I have a personal interest at stake; compare Classical Philology 7.24 ff. But there are obvious limits to the space at my disposal and I must refrain. Perhaps I shall be able to return to these matters upon some other occasion.

On page 8, note 5 it is strange that Professor Capps's articles in The American Journal of Archaeology 10.288 ff. and Transactions of the American Philological Association 31.133 f. are not cited. In connection with page 17, note 42 it may be noted that Professor Foster's article appeared in the University of Iowa (not Michigan) Studies. On page 19, note 1, add a reference to Krause, Quaestiones Aristophaneae Scaenicae, and on page 22 to Wolf, Die Bezeichnung von Ort und Zeit in der Attischen Tragödie. A reference to Professor Goodell's article, Transactions of the American Philological Association 41.94 f. would be in place on page 82, note 21.

It is no part of a reviewer's function to advertise his own opinions, but possibly I may be pardoned for reconstructing my own view from the scattered hints of this critique. It will be understood that the following statements are entirely provisional and are subject to modification in the light of new discoveries. I agree with Mr. Conrad (9) that *μέρος* divisions of New Comedy were variable and were not uniformly five in number. When the *μέρος* divisions were set off by *XOPOT*, the Roman poet, I hold, must have been aware of them and must have continued to be more or less aware of them in his translation. I do not think, however, that he was scrupulous to retain the same number of divisions in his translation as there had been in the original, or to make them uniformly five. His practice varied. Sometimes he brought the divisions over bodily into his

version and instructed his stage manager to mark them in the performance by pauses. Such, I conceive, are many of the instances cited in Chapter V. Sometimes a *μέρος* division was obscured entirely, owing to contamination. Sometimes, for whatever reason, the Roman poet altered the text about a *μέρος* division and produced continuous action. This concession I make to Mr. Conrad, but I believe this occurred much less frequently than he does. Many of the passages discussed in Chapter III, some of those even in Chapter II, and a few of those in Chapter IV belong here.

Sometimes, and in my opinion this most frequently happened, whatever technique is found automatically resulted when the chorus was dropped. For example, if a character is present just before and just after a *XOPOT* and announces neither his withdrawal nor his return (and this not rarely occurs), the actor need not retire and the omission of the intermezzic chorus will automatically produce continuous action. On the other hand, if the character refers to his withdrawal, we automatically get a situation like those "critical" instances in Chapter V. Still again, if the character who enters after *XOPOT* is different from the one who retired before it, a vacant stage automatically results. Moreover, since in Greek plays vacant stages sometimes occur also in the midst of a *μέρος*, the Roman poet had the option of blurring such an automatic vacant stage by introducing an alteration in the text, of letting it pass like a mid-*μέρος* vacant stage, or of marking it with a pause in the performance. In my opinion, many of the vacant stages listed in Chapter IV came about in this manner. Of course, Plautus and Terence always knew whether a given vacant stage replaced an original *XOPOT* or merely represented a non-essential vacant stage in the middle of a *μέρος*, but for us it is now often extremely difficult or even impossible to distinguish them.

I am of the opinion that many Roman comedies were presented continuously or comparatively so, and that in most or all of them the pauses were fewer than in the corresponding Greek plays. But I am also convinced that essential pauses in the performance were not infrequent. Whether *actus* had a technical meaning in the second century B. C. and, if so, precisely what it was, I am not prepared to state categorically, but in any case the division into five acts as a hard and fast rule for Plautus and Terence has run its course. As applied to Terence, it probably originated in the first century B. C.

Infallibly to determine at what points pauses were allowed at the premier performance of the Latin comedies is at present beyond our powers and would possess no great meaning, even if the effort should prove successful. But to probe these plays in order to discover *μέρος* divisions in the Greek originals will always be a fascinating and innocent diversion for scholars and will be attended with increasing success as the instances of *XOPOT* in New Comedy multiply.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

ROY C. FLICKINGER.